

### REMARKS

Claims 1 to 20 are pending in the application, of which claims 1 and 13 are independent. Favorable reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.<sup>1</sup>

Initially, Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 8, 9, 12, 17, 19 and 20 contain allowable subject matter.

Claims 1, 4, 7, 8 and 19 were objected to for the alleged informalities noted on page 2 of the Office Action. As shown above, Applicants have amended the claims to address these alleged informalities. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Turning to the art rejections, claims 1 to 5, 7, 10, 11, 13 to 16, and 18 were rejected over WO00/764091 (Sakai); and claims 1, 3 and 6 were rejected over U.S. Patent No. 5,519,581 (Liepe). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

Regarding the rejection over Sakai, Applicants note that independent claim 1 requires that the external contact be connected to at least one of the terminals by one or more spot welds. Independent claim 13 requires that the terminals be connected to the at least two external contacts by spot welding. In the figures and English-language abstract of Sakai, Applicants find no disclosure relating to spot welding. In this regard, Fig. 6 was referenced in the Office Action for its alleged anticipation of the claims. However, referring to Fig. 6 of Sakai, it appears from this figure that the entire surface of terminal 1 connects to external contact 10, i.e., there is a large surface area connection, not a connection made via spot welds. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 1 and 13 are different from, and patentable over, Sakai.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Examiner is urged to independently confirm this recitation of the pending claims.

Regarding the rejection over Liepe, Applicants note that claim 1 is directed to a surface-mounted component.<sup>2</sup> Liepe, by contrast, is not mounted via its surface, but rather is mounted onto circuit board 13 by inserting leads 5 and 6 into plated through holds 12 and 11, respectively (see Fig. 1 of Liepe). Since Liepe does not disclose a surface-mounted component, Applicants submit that claim 1 is also patentable over Liepe.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1 and 13 are believed to be patentable.

Each of the dependent claims is also believed to define patentable features of the invention. Each dependent claim partakes of the novelty of its corresponding independent claim and, as such, has not been discussed specifically herein.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Regarding formal matters, Applicants note that the Form PTO-1449 received with the Office Action does not have the Examiner's initials placed next to JP2002280263. Applicants believe that to be an oversight and are submitting herewith a copy of that Form PTO-1449, and another copy of JP2002280263 (with English-language Abstract). The Examiner is respectfully

---

<sup>2</sup> Claim 13 was not rejected over Liepe.

Applicants : Ralf Deisenhofer, et al.  
Serial No. : 10/522,214  
Filed : January 14, 2005  
Page : 9

Attorney's Docket No.: 11333-023001

requested to initial that reference on the Form PTO-1449 and is also authorized to charge any Information Disclosure Statement fees, if necessary, to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Finally, Applicants are submitting herewith an original executed Declaration to substitute for the Declaration currently on file. The "filed herewith" box on the Declaration on-file was checked after signing.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney can be reached at the address shown below. All telephone calls should be directed to the undersigned at 617-521-7896.

Please apply any fees or credits due in this case, which are not already covered by check, to Deposit Account 06-1050 referencing Attorney Docket No. 14219-077US1.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 20, 2006



Paul A. Pysher  
Reg. No. 40,780

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
225 Franklin Street  
Boston, MA 02110-2804  
Telephone: (617) 542-5070  
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906